UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/540,026   | 01/25/2006  | Bertram Sugg         | R.304045            | 8866             |
| 2119 7590 09/15/2008<br>RONALD E. GREIGG<br>GREIGG & GREIGG P.L.L.C.<br>1423 POWHATAN STREET, UNIT ONE<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
|  |             |                      | GORDON, BRYAN P     |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 2834                |                  |
|  |             |                      |                     |                  |
|  |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|  |             |                      | 09/15/2008          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

*In re* Application of SUGG, BERTRAM

Appl. No.: 10/540,026 Filed: January 25, 2006

For: PIEZOELECTRIC ACTUATOR AND A METHOD

FOR ITS MANUFACTURE

WITHDRAWAL OF RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT 37 CFR 1.144

This letter is in response to applicant's petition, filed 8/8/08, to withdraw the holding of a restriction requirement in the final office action mailed 1/9/08.

Applicant's petition is GRANTED.

A review of the record indicates that the examiner's interpretation of newly presented claims 29-32 in the aforementioned office action was incorrect. Since claims 29-32 are apparatus claims, described as a product-by-process, they should not have been treated as method of making claims and, therefore, should have been examined along with the originally elected apparatus claims 9, 10, 13 and 14.

The application is being forwarded to the examiner for action on the merits of claims 29-32, as well as previously filed claims 9, 10, 13 and 14.

Any inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Darren Schuberg at 571 272-2044.

/Sharon A. Gibson/ Director, Technology Center 2800

RONALD E. GREIGG GREIGG & GREIGG P.L.L.C. 1423 POWHATAN STREET, UNIT ONE ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314